

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ELIAS STAVRINIDES,

No. C 15-03118 WHA

Plaintiff,

v.

**ORDER RE RECENTLY
RECEIVED LETTER**

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC
COMPANY,

Defendant.

The Court is in receipt of a letter from plaintiff requesting to reopen his case. After several warnings, an October 29 order dismissed plaintiff's case for failure to prosecute (Dkt. No. 27). Defendant PG&E had filed a motion to dismiss on September 4, to which plaintiff failed to respond. Magistrate Judge Kandis Westmore, who then presided over the case, issued an order for plaintiff to show cause, by October 15, as to why he did not timely respond to defendant's motion (Dkt. No. 18). Plaintiff did not respond to that order. The case was then reassigned to the undersigned judge. A second order to show cause requested that plaintiff show cause, in writing, why this case should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute by noon on October 27. The order warned that failure to respond, or to show sufficient cause as to why plaintiff has not responded to previous orders, would result in dismissal of the case for failure to prosecute (Dkt. No. 26). Plaintiff again failed to file any response.

1 Plaintiff's recent letter simply states that he did not know he needed to respond to
2 defendant's motion to dismiss and says that he changed residences on October 10 (two weeks
3 after Judge Westmore issued the first OSC). Moreover, plaintiff's letter still does contain any
4 opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss, which both OSCs requested. Despite multiple
5 warnings that the case would be dismissed, plaintiff has taken no steps to prosecute this case
6 since he filed it in July. Plaintiff's request is **DENIED**.

7

8 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

9
10 Dated: November 17, 2015.

11 
12 WILLIAM ALSUP
13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28